

I. Adjustments to Investment Initiatives		
Decision: Should investment initiatives 2c and 2d be increased?		
Co-Chairs' Recommendation: Increase funding by \$440K to Healthy, Active, and Engaged so as to have more fiscal balance between the four program components (\$270K to More Programs for Older Adults and \$170K to Meeting the Needs of People with Disabilities).		
a) Increase #2d, More Programs for Older Adults, doubling the amount for a new total of \$270K		
Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
There has been significant support at the public meetings for increasing the funding of 2d to create more fiscal balance between 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d.	Parks staff determined \$135,000 is a sufficient annual amount.  Additional funding in the second highest priority, may reduce or eliminate funding for lower priority projects, depending on the overall funding amount	
Additional funding would increase overall program capacity, allowing for up to 32 additional programs per year, serving potentially 336 more people	There are other recreation providers for older adults. A larger burden should be placed on senior centers to provide this service.	
The city's demographics shows that 29% are aged 50 and over and 11% are 65 and over; the percentage of people over 65 is projected grow to 20% by 2040.		
b) Increase #2c, Meeting the Needs of People with Disabilities, doubling the amount to a new total of \$170K		
Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
This program's funding has not increased in about 20 years. It benefits families that aren't usually able to advocate politically, and increasing funding results in a more equitable distribution between Healthy, Active, and Engaged sub-initiatives.	Parks staff determined \$85,000 is a sufficient annual amount.	
Additional funding would increase program capacity—currently capped at 55 individuals due to the ratio needed for care providers. The city's demographics show that 9% of the population has a disability.	Additional funding in the second highest priority, may reduce or eliminate funding for lower priority projects, depending on the overall funding amount	
2% of those under 18 have a disability. 6.6% of those between 18-64 have a disability. 35% of those 65 and over have a disability.		

## II. Adjustments to Investment Initiatives

Decision: Should there be a corresponding cut to the Programs with People category to balance the additions recommended for the programs for older adults and people with disabilities?

Co-chairs' Recommendation: Reduce the Get Moving Fund (# 13) by \$220K (new total: \$980K)

Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
The Get Moving Fund is intended to provide grants to organizations to increase active recreation programs for people. The additional funds for Parks programs for older adults and people with disabilities will also increase active recreation opportunities, so a corresponding cut to the Get Moving Fund makes sense.	The support evidenced for programs for older adults at the January public meetings leads to the conclusion that <i>more</i> programs in total are needed. A corresponding reduction to the Get Moving Fund defeats the intent of adding the funding to these initiatives.	
\$980,000 is still a very significant amount for Parks to allocate to partners for active recreation programs.		

## III. Adjustments to Investment Initiatives

Decision: Should investment initiative #7, Saving Our City Forests, be increased?

Co-Chairs' Recommendation: Increase funding for #7, Saving Our City Forests, by \$1.9 million (new total: \$2.85 million)

Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
Parks staff underestimated GSP needs in the original proposal and these additional funds will address the agreed upon GSP 2025 goals. Increasing funding to \$2.85 million per year would allow GSP to achieve its restoration goals by 2025, as outlined in the GSP strategic plan.	GSP goals could be extended beyond 2025, which would not require additional funding.	

Increasing funding keeps GSP work on target with Climate Action Plan, City Comprehensive Plan, and Growth Management Act.		
<b>IV. Confirm list of priorities</b> <u>Decision: Is this the final list of investment initiatives?</u>		
<u>Co-Chairs' recommendation:</u> Confirm these investment initiatives as our final recommendation.		

<b>V. Total Recommended Funding Amount</b> <u>Decision: What should the final recommended funding amount be?</u>		
<u>Co-Chairs' recommendation:</u> The Co-Chairs recommend funding the full list of projects as recommended in this paper (the additions to 2c. and 2.d, corresponding reduction to 13, and addition to 7); plus an overhead amount of \$1.6 million needed for hiring, creation of performance measures, technical support, and accountability reporting.		
<b>a) Include an implementation and accountability amount needed for investment initiative implementation (3%, equaling an additional \$1.6 m based on the total package recommended by the Co-chairs)</b>		
<b>Arguments in favor</b>	<b>Arguments against</b>	<b>Committee consensus</b>
Similar to the current parks levy, the Library levy and SDOT's Bridging the Gap levy, needed staffing changes for accountability and performance measurement can be captured through an overhead amount applied to the overall cost of the ballot measure.	All of the investment initiatives should be proportionately reduced to accommodate accountability and performance measurement needs.	
<b>b) Fund \$57 million total package</b>		
<b>Arguments in favor</b>	<b>Arguments against</b>	<b>Committee consensus</b>
The past many years of deferred major maintenance for Park facilities speaks to the need for a larger package than previous ballot measures. Only by making a significant inroad into major maintenance can the backlog begin to shrink. Plus, the contraction in programming Parks has undergone during the recession does not reflect the needs of the people of Seattle, or the capacity for Parks and Recreation to contribute to the health and welfare of the people of the City.	\$57 million is too much to ask the people of Seattle to pay for – it is more than twice the amount of the current levy. With the many competing issues coming before the voters, Parks should not ask for such a significant increase.	

VI. General Fund Baseline		
Co-Chairs recommendation: Limit the amount of General Fund that can be cut from Parks' budget after a ballot measure is approved. Use the 2014 General Fund contribution of \$89m, annually adjusted for inflation, as the base.		
Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
Ensuring the ballot measure provides additional programs and services for Parks and Recreation, as intended by the Committee, requires a base level of General Fund support. The 2014 amount of \$89m, adjusted annually for inflation, is a mid-range choice – it is not the low of the recession, nor is it a high point.		
Using a percentage of the General Fund as the base for Parks budget in the future limits the budget flexibility the City may need, especially during a significant recession when competing City needs and reduced revenues require flexible budgeting. No City agency receives a guaranteed percentage of the General Fund; this has not been the anti-supplantation method of any previous funding measure.	To ensure the funding is additive, the amount the City agrees will be Parks base level of funding should be a percentage of the General Fund; for example, Parks currently receives approximately 10% of the General Fund, and this should remain the percentage.	

## VII. Recommended Funding Mechanism

Decision: What should the recommended funding mechanism be?

Co-Chairs' recommendation: The Co-Chairs recommend that a Metropolitan Park District (Park District) be the funding mechanism to provide long term, sustainable funding for Seattle Parks and Recreation; and that the Park District be consistent with the Metropolitan Park District Summary attached to this decision agenda.

Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
<p>The Committee examined the needs of our park system and developed a prioritized list of projects based on real needs facing Parks. The natures of the projects on the Committee's list make it very difficult to address these needs with short term levy funding. The projects include basic, on-going, Park operations and maintenance and include making a significant dent in a \$267m major maintenance backlog. The basic services Parks provides contribute significantly to the physical, mental and environmental health of the City, make our neighborhoods places people want to live, and strengthen the City's economy. Because a Park District is a permanent funding source, it is the only means to reliably fund programs and services, and make a real inroad into decreasing the major maintenance backlog.</p>	<p>The permanence of a Park District means people do not have the option to say no in the future that they have with levies. Plus, State law says that once a Park District is approved, it cannot be dissolved by the voters, only the District Board can end the District.</p>	
<p>Park Districts are new to Seattle but have been used elsewhere in Washington, including Tacoma. Seattle has a Transportation Benefit District, which is a similar taxing authority to a Park District.</p>	<p>Parks has a long history of being successful with levies being approved by the voters. The City of Seattle has never used a Park District.</p>	
<p>The City Council will not approve a levy that would fund the entire list of initiatives at \$57m because this would use a large percentage of the City's overall levy capacity and there are many competing priorities. A \$30m levy is probably the maximum amount the Council would approve. Therefore, the only means to fund the full list of</p>		

priorities is a Park District because the amount does not count against the overall City levy cap.		
--	--	--

<b>VIII. Recommended Future Oversight</b> <b>Decision: What should be the recommended structure for the Future Oversight Committee?</b>		
<p><u>Co-Chairs' recommendation:</u> The Co-Chairs recommend that the Citizens' Oversight Committee be comprised of four members of the Board of Park Commissioners and seven additional members appointed by the City. The Parks Superintendent would appoint the chair of the Oversight Committee. Oversight duties are described in the Levy and Park District summaries attached to this decision agenda.</p>		
Arguments in favor	Arguments against	Committee consensus
<p>The mix of capital projects and on-going maintenance and programming in the current proposal is significantly different from the past 2 levies which were either primarily (2000) or totally (2008) capital levies. This leads to a recommendation for more involvement by the Park Board.</p> <p>The combination of Park Board members and additional community members provides the best mix of Park Board expertise and community members.</p>	<p><u>Arguments for a separate Committee:</u> A committee of people totally separate from the Park Board allows more people to be involved.</p> <p><u>Arguments for the Park Board to serve as the Committee:</u> The Board is assigned oversight of Parks and Recreation; the way the proposed package is integrated into all that Parks does, makes the distinction of what comes under the purview of the Board and what under the purview of an Oversight Committee muddled and potentially confusing for the public.</p>	

**Co-Chairs' Recommendation for items to Include in the Inter Local Agreement for a Seattle Park District**

*February 21, 2014*

The Co-Chairs recommend a Seattle Park District with the following elements included in the inter local agreement adopted by City ordinance.

1. District Boundaries. Park District boundaries will mirror the boundaries of the City of Seattle as they currently exist or as they may exist following future annexations.
2. Park District Governing Board. The Seattle City Council will be the Park District governing Board. City Councilmembers will not receive any additional compensation as members of the Park District governing board.
3. Compliance with City rules and laws. The Park District governing board would contract via inter local agreement with the City making Seattle Parks and Recreation Department (Parks) the sole provider of park and recreation services for the Park District. As a City department, Parks is required to comply with City laws, ethics rules and labor contracts.
4. Citizens' Oversight Committee. In the inter local agreement between the Park District and the City, the District would require the City to form a Citizens' Oversight Committee to provide advice and oversight for District services. The committee would include four members of the Park Board PLUS seven additional community members. The Superintendent of Parks and Recreation would appoint the Chair of the Oversight Committee.
  - A. Oversight Committee terms for Park Board members will coincide with their Park Board terms. The 7 other members will serve 3-year terms that begin in April.
  - B. The Oversight Committee will advise the Mayor, City Council, Park Board and department on District-funded spending and activities, including:
    1. Making recommendations to the Superintendent on annual allocation of the Major Projects Challenge Fund.
    2. Reviewing the annual District report including assessment of performance measures and reporting to the Superintendent and Park Board on implementation issues, concerns and needed adjustments in services or spending.
    3. Holding public meetings and making recommendations to the Superintendent as input to each 6-year update to the District spending plan.
5. Ownership. Park and recreation land, facilities, and equipment preserved and maintained with Park District funds are and will remain the property of the City of Seattle. Any new or replacement land, facilities, and equipment created or developed with Park District funds will become the property of the City of Seattle. Selling City-owned park land or facilities, whether they were bought with City or Park District funds, would be subject to Initiative 42 restrictions on the sale of park property.

6. Condemnation. If condemnation of property is needed to perform Park District services, Parks will follow City condemnation procedures.
7. Relationship to City Budgeting. The Mayor would direct the development and implementation of Parks' budgets and work programs. City Council would approve Parks budgets and provide oversight. The Park District Board would approve a final Park District budget showing how Park District revenues would fund part of the Parks' budget.
8. Continued City Funding of Parks. The City will continue to use City revenues to fund Parks and will continue to allocate 2014 levels (at least \$89 million/year, adjusted annually for inflation) of General Fund revenues to support Parks' services and facilities unless the City Council by a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote determines that a natural disaster or exigent economic circumstances prevent the Council from maintaining this level of General Fund support. Parks' charter revenues (10% of certain City fines and fees) will continue to be allocated solely to park and recreation purposes as provided in Article XI Section 3 of the City Charter.
9. Initial Tax Rate and Spending Levels. For the first 6 years, the District intends to collect no more than \$54 million/year, adjusted for inflationary costs. If the levy had been in effect in 2014, the amount would translate into an estimated tax rate of \$0.42 per \$1,000 of the value of assessed property. This would be a \$168 assessment for the owner of a house valued at \$400,000. Park District revenues in the first six years would be spent to accomplish the Prioritized List of Investment Initiatives as proposed by the Parks Legacy Citizens Advisory Committee and amended by the Mayor and Council.
10. Spending Beyond Year 6. Parks will conduct a community-oriented process to determine spending priorities every 6-8 years through the life of the Park District. The Park District governing board, after considering the recommendations from the public process and the Citizens' Oversight Committee, would determine the spending levels and updated Prioritized List of Investment Initiatives for years 7 through 12 as part of the 2021 budget process. This process of adjusting the spending levels (with annual inflation adjustments) and a revised list of investment initiatives would continue for the life of the Park District.
11. Dissolving the Park District. While not required by State law, the Park District governing board will dissolve the District if there is a vote of the people of Seattle calling for its dissolution.